

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

ELMER J. BUCKARDT, et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 2:19-CV-52-RAJ

ORDER


This matter comes before the Court on Defendants Elmer J. Buckardt and Karen A. Buckardt's (collectively, "Defendants") "Motion to extend date of summon [sic] in civil action" ("Motion"). Dkt. # 4. Defendants' Motion, filed February 25, 2019, is a one-sentence motion that reads in full: "On February 20, 2019 defendants are requesting a motion to extend summon [sic] in a civil action for 30 days." *Id.* Plaintiff United States of America ("Plaintiff") opposed the Motion a day after it was filed, contending that it was premature as of that date because Plaintiff had not yet served Defendants. Dkt. # 8.

It is not clear what date Defendants request that this Court extend. If the date is the service deadline for Plaintiff, then Defendants' motion is unnecessary, as they were already served on March 13, 2019. Dkt. ## 13-15. If Defendants request an extension of

1 their own deadline to file a responsive pleading to Plaintiff's Complaint, then this Motion
2 is also unnecessary at this time, as Defendants filed a Motion to Dismiss on March 11,
3 2019. Dkt. # 12.

4 Accordingly, given the vagueness of Defendants' request and the lack of necessity
5 for extension of the service deadline at this time, the Court **DENIES WITHOUT**
6 **PREJUDICE** Defendants' Motion. Dkt. # 4.

7
8 DATED this 28th day of March, 2019.

9
10 
11 The Honorable Richard A. Jones
12 United States District Judge
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26